DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1.   The terminal disclaimer filed on January 29th, 2010 disclaiming the terminal

portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the

expiration date of Patent Number 7,249,085 has been reviewed and is accepted. The

terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 1-10 and 16-20 are allowed, subject to an examiner's amendment

described below.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

3.   An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes

and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided

by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be

submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview

with Robyn Wagner on April 5th, 2010.

THE APPLICATION HAS BEEN AMENDED AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING PAGES:

Claim 1 (currently amended)   A computer-implemented method in an auction

between a plurality of potential bidders, comprising:

generating a sequence of values;

creating a buyer view of the auction that includes a first value included in the

sequence of generated values;

prior to displaying a price to a first potential bidder, using a processor to transform, using a characteristic associated with a quality of an auction item, said first value into a first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

creating a first bidder view of the auction, for display to said first potential bidder, that includes the first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

prior to displaying a price to a second potential bidder, <u>using a processor to</u> transform[[ing]] said first value into a second bidder comparative bid parameter value;

creating a second bidder view of the auction, for display to said second potential bidder, that includes the second bidder comparative bid parameter value.

Reasons for Allowance

4.   The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art of record (Johnson et a. WO 98/38844) teaches an auction system for the provision of energy supply where the provider transmits to a moderator the rate it is willing to charge. The moderator processes these bids according to specified rules of the auction in order to produce an 'apples-to-apples' comparison of the rates. The prior art of record (Porat et al. US Patent Number 7,330,826) teaches a user interface that displays value scores for seller offers that lets a buyer limit the number of seller offers displayed to the buyer. Further, Porat teaches that the seller bots adjust the sellers' offers base on near perfect information about the buyer and the competition.

While the prior art is similar to the instant application in many respects, there are clear patentable distinctions. The prior art fails to teach a computer-implemented method in an auction between a plurality of potential bidders, comprising generating a

sequence of values, creating a buyer view of the auction that includes a first value

included in the sequence of generated values, prior to displaying a price to a first

potential bidder, using a processor to <u>transform</u>, using a characteristic associated with a

quality of an auction item, said first value into a first bidder comparative bid parameter

value, creating a first bidder view of the auction, for display to said first potential bidder,

that includes the first bidder comparative bid parameter value, prior to displaying a price

to a second potential bidder, using a processor to <u>transform</u> said first value into a

second bidder comparative bid parameter value and creating a second bidder view of

the auction, for display to said second potential bidder, that includes the second bidder

comparative bid parameter value.

5.   The following is a formal statement of reasons for allowance:

        Claim 1 is allowed because the best prior art of record, alone or in combination,

neither discloses nor fairly suggests the limitations, a computer-implemented method in

an auction between a plurality of potential bidders, comprising:

        generating a sequence of values;

        creating a buyer view of the auction that includes a first value included in the

sequence of generated values;

        prior to displaying a price to a first potential bidder, using a processor to

transform, using a characteristic associated with a quality of an auction item, said first

value into a first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

creating a first bidder view of the auction, for display to said first potential bidder, that includes the first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

prior to displaying a price to a second potential bidder, using a processor to transform said first value into a second bidder comparative bid parameter value;

creating a second bidder view of the auction, for display to said second potential bidder, that includes the second bidder comparative bid parameter value.

Claims 2-5 are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above by virtue of their dependence on allowed claim 1.

Claim 6 is allowed because the best prior art of record, alone or in combination, neither discloses nor fairly suggests the limitations, a machine readable medium having stored thereon executable code which causes a machine to perform a method to conduct an auction between a plurality of bidders, said method comprising:

generating a sequence of values;

creating a buyer view of the auction that includes a first value included in the sequence of generated values;

prior to displaying a price to a first potential bidder, transforming, using a characteristic associated with a quality of an auction item, said first value into a first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

creating a first bidder view of the auction, for display to a first potential bidder, that includes the first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

prior to displaying a price to a second potential bidder, transforming said first value into a second bidder comparative bid parameter value;

creating a second bidder view of the auction, for display to said second potential bidder, that includes the second bidder comparative bid parameter value.

Claims 7-10 are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above by virtue of their dependence on allowed claim 6.

Claim 16 is allowed because the best prior art of record, alone or in combination, neither discloses nor fairly suggests the limitations, a system for conducting an auction between a plurality of bidders, comprising:

a processor; and

a memory coupled with the processor, wherein the memory is configured to provide the processor with instructions which when executed cause the processor to:

generate a sequence of values;

create a buyer view of the auction that includes a first value included in the sequence of generated values;

prior to displaying a price to a first potential bidder, transform, using a characteristic associated with a quality of an auction item, said first value into a first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

create a first bidder view of the auction, for display to a first potential bidder, that includes the first bidder comparative bid parameter value;

prior to displaying a price to a second potential bidder, transform said first value

into a second bidder comparative bid parameter value;

create a second bidder view of the auction, for display to said second potential

bidder, that includes the second bidder comparative bid parameter value.

Claims 17-20 are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above by virtue

of their dependence on allowed claim 16.

6.   Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later

than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably

accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on

Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JESSICA L. LEMIEUX whose telephone number is

(571)270-3445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8AM-

5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                                            Jessica L Lemieux
                                                            Examiner
                                                            Art Unit 3693

/J. L. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 3693
May 2010

/Stefanos Karmis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693